

A MEETING  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2021

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, from the Department of Architecture, and Speaker of the Faculty Senate. We start each meeting with a land acknowledgement.

Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogóhó:nq', the Cayuga nation. The Gayogóhó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogóhó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogóhó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters.

The meeting is now called to order. So, at this point, we have 15 minutes, and then another 15 minutes Q&A for President Martha Pollack.

MARTHA POLLACK: Well, hello everybody. All of you behind me on the screen, and the handful of you here. I know that the past year and a half been extraordinarily difficult. Faculty, staff, students, all of us have experienced a lot of staff, and then, of course, there was the bomb scare this past weekend, and then the Shelter in Place order yesterday.

I've been really just awed by how well this community has come together. The faculty, you've dealt, and you continue to deal with, so many things with public health challenges, with challenges of limited childcare or elder care, with unpredictable school closings, and of course, with illness and in some cases, with the loss of family and friends. And then the stresses of the past few days.

So, I really just wanted to thank everyone for everything that you do, especially for all the support of our students, and I want to urge you to be gentle and kind and flexible with your students, with each other, and especially with yourself.

Now, remarkably, while we've all been dealing with this, the community has also continued to further its core mission of teaching, research, and engagement. And as I always do when I come to these meetings, I would like to highlight some of the faculty, some really remarkable accomplishments over the past year. I do so with some trepidation, because I realize that for many, it's been difficult or impossible even to be as productive as normal during that period. And so, I want to reiterate that's okay. Be kind to yourself. This pandemic eventually will end, it will become endemic, but things will go back to a more normal pace.

With that said, let me note that last year, fiscal year '21, across the three campuses, our faculty submitted a record \$3.3 billion in grants, and a record -- wasn't quite a record -- but very high, \$961 million in grant funding was awarded. Now, grants are, of course, not directly relevant to every field, and they are just one measure of academic success, but they do matter. And these numbers are doubly impressive given that they reflect work during the pandemic.

I also want to offer congratulations to our faculty members who have been elected into one of the national academies this past year. Roberto Sierra and Meejin Yoon into the American Academy of Arts and Letters. Maureen Hanson and Bernice Grafstein into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Jeff Tester, an emeritus professor, Lance Collins into the National Academy of Engineering. Anurag Agrawal and Maureen Hanson into the National Academy of Sciences. And then just a few weeks ago, Hugh Hemmings at Weill Cornell Medicine was elected to the National Academy of Medicine.

And I also want to congratulate our three assistant professors who received National Science Foundation Early Career Development awards. Fatma Baytar, Austin Benson, and Phillip Milner. And Andrew Musser, who received an Early Career award from the United States Department of Energy.

Now, if I were to give the full list of faculty awards over the past six months or past year, it would just be much too long. I'm just going to mention one, because it is very, very significant. Scott Emr, the Frank H.T. Rhodes class of 1956, professor of Molecular Biology and Genetics, and also director of the Weill Institute for Cell and Molecular Biology, was awarded the very prestigious Shaw Prize in Life Sciences and Medicine this past summer for his landmark discovery of the ESCRT, Endosomal Sorting Complexes Required for Transport Pathway.

So, congratulations to Scott, and really to all of our faculty who have honored with a range of prizes and awards this past year.

Shifting gears, I want to give you just a quick update on our incoming freshmen, the class of 2025. They have been so excited to be here. I'm sure all of you have seen that after mostly spending their last year, year and a half of high school, with remote education. We have a record 3,750 students. That growth is part of the growth we've had planned with the opening of the North Campus Residential expansion, the new dormitories, on North Campus that opened up this fall. They come from 64 countries and 49 states. If you know anyone in Wyoming, we need to pick up some students from Wyoming next year.

19.4% of them are first generation. This is something we've been really working on, and so it's really nice to see that growth. 55% are women, 28% identify as underrepresented minorities. Nearly half are receiving need-based aid. And of course, we also have a full complement of grad and professional students. We have 106 new medical students, and we have 350 new students at Cornell Tech.

A few other updates from around the university. First of all, by now, most of you know my thoughts on certain rankings, notably U.S. News & World Report which use very problematic, even pernicious incentives. But there are some rankings that use clear and defensible metrics, and they can be valuable.

And I'm actually really proud of the fact that Forbes, every year Forbes publishes a ranking of best employers by state. They do this with an anonymous survey of 80,000 Americans who are working for employers with at least 500 employees, and they ask them to rate their employees on criteria such as safety of the work environment, competitiveness of compensation, opportunities for advancement, and how likely they'd be to recommend their employer to others.

And I think it's really quite a testament to the faculty, and to everyone here, that Cornell ranks second in the entire state of New York as one of the -- as the Forbes best -- second best employer in the state of New York. I should also mention that the -- we were beat out only by Regeneron, which is a company whose CEO is himself a Cornell alumnus.

Another ranking. You know, sustainability continues to be a really key priority for us. You all know our aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2035. And the Sierra Club has a ranking of cool schools, 312 higher education institutions, ranked on dimensions such as energy, air, and climate, transportation, and engagement, and Cornell ranked number four. We're the number four cool school. The strengths there are largely due to the work of the faculty in the Cornell Atkinson Center, as well as our facilities staff.

And I want to give just one example. There's so many things that the faculty are doing in this space, but one that I thought was particularly interesting was just last month. Four faculty members, Eswar Prasad, Bob Howarth, Anthony Ingraffea, and Ari Juels testified to the New York State Assembly about the potential environmental harm that would be caused by returning carbon-based power plants

to use -- to provide the power needed to mine cryptocurrency. A particularly interesting topic to my mind.

I know that the Faculty Senate is very interested in university finances, so let me give you a couple of updates there. First of all, the endowment. I'm sure by now you've all seen the truly remarkable year that our endowment saw. There was a 41.9% growth in our investments. An unheard-of number. This is a result of a number of factors. It was a very robust market. If you look around the country, many of our peers had the same or even higher investment returns. But there's also been a multi-year effort by our investment office team to restructure the asset classes to reduce fees, management fees, and to implement rigorous risk monitoring and rebalancing frameworks.

Now, I want to spend a moment, I know almost all of you understand endowments, but let me spend a moment reminding you just a little bit about how they work, because a lot of people tend to think of endowment as just one big pot of money that we can use for anything. It's not. It's more than 8,000 separate accounts, almost all of which have a use restricted by the donor. So, the donor says I want to fund an endowed professor in anthropology, and all the money that comes from the interest on that donation has to go to fund the salary of that professor.

Moreover, such gifts are intended to be permanent. So, we have to take the money, and invest it in such a way that we use some of the earnings to pay for that salary, and then we reinvest the rest of the earnings so that, over time, we continue to have enough money in interest to pay the salary even given inflation. And even when the endowment payout is below inflation.

It's also really important to remember that endowment earnings are incredibly volatile. Last year they were 41.9%. The year before, they were 1.9%, which is less than inflation. So, to ensure that the endowment achieves its intended purpose, each of those 8,000 funds achieves its intended purpose, as a university, we are very disciplined in endowment spending. We have a payout formula. We pay out

approximately 5% of the endowment each year. There's actually a cap on how much you can pay out by -- for New York state. And only under the most extraordinary circumstances do we break discipline and pay out more than that.

Last year, in fact, our board agreed that the pandemic had created truly extraordinary circumstances. I appreciate the input of the Faculty Senate in helping us convince the board of the need for these extra funds. The board approved an additional one-time payout fee to help cover those essential pandemic costs. Things like setting up our Coronavirus testing lab.

But in general, it's our and our board's responsibility to ensure that we not only have the resources we need today, but we have the resources we need for the next 150 years. Universities, unlike most institutions, really last for centuries.

So, we remain very disciplined in our payout rate, that rate of about 5%, to guarantee that we have the security to weather further downturns in the market, or larger shocks like recessions or pandemics.

And that brings me to my next topic, which is our new Capital Campaign. How do we get the money into that endowment? We raise it, for the most part, from donors. And so, we have publicly launched a Capital Campaign just a few weeks ago. The new campaign is called "Do the Greatest Good." It's a phrase that was used by Ezra Cornell himself. So, 156 years ago, here's Ezra Cornell. He has a fortune to invest, and he's looking for a way to invest it. And he wanted, as he put in his writings, "to do the greatest good with the resources he had, and to do it for posterity."

And he had plenty of options. There wasn't any shortage of people to help or ways to help them, but he ultimately decided that the way he could have the greatest and most lasting impact was to invest in the university, this university, with its mission of "Any Person, Any Study."

So, today, we look again to do the greatest good, and we do that with three key aids. The first is to educate students to be leaders who carry the Cornell ethos forward. That means critically committing to and supporting student access so that we are always a place for any person. It means ensuring student wellness of mind and body, and it means building, I talk about this all the time, this culture of educational verve, pursuing new ways to teach and to learn and ideas about learning that are creative, and evidence based.

Second, we aim to tackle some of the world's most challenging problems, moving from theory to practice and back again. This is a university with, as all of you know, a remarkable openness to innovation, and an unparalleled breadth and willingness to collaborate across boundaries in critical areas that I talk with donors about all the time. Things like global sustainability, human and animal health, human creativity, social and economic equity, technology, and society.

And finally, we aim to connect Cornell with the world through public engagement, through our international programs and our global reach, and of course, through our expanding presence in New York City, which complements what we do here in Ithaca.

Now, the goals for this campaign are very ambitious, in line with our ambitions as a university. We have a target of raising \$5 billion, which includes \$3 billion for the Ithaca campus, \$1.5 billion for Weill Cornell Medicine, and half a billion for Cornell Tech. And as part of that overall goal, we're aiming to raise 500 million, half a billion dollars, for undergraduate financial aid with the specific of increasing the number of aided students by 1,000, this in a period where we're growing enrolment by 650; reducing debt for our graduates, our undergraduates when they graduate, by 25%; and ensuring that all of our students have the opportunities for meaningful summer ( ) experience.

It is a high bar, but we've made a lot of progress on it already. You've probably heard about the gift from the Starr Foundation, and Joan and Sandy Weill in the Weill Family Foundation, to create a

scholarship program at the medical school that allows debt free education for students who qualify for financial aid. You've doubtless heard about the Damian () Gift for the Cornell Peter and Stephanie Nolan School of Hotel Administration, all of which will go to financial aid so that students can have access to the wonderful education provided there.

We've had naming gifts for the Jeb E. Brooks School of Public Policy, and the Ann S. Bowers College of Computing. Money to support the CIS building, money to support the new Atkinson Multidisciplinary Building, money to support the Lab of Ornithology, Center for Conservation by Acoustics from Lisa Yang. Wonderful undergraduate scholarship gift from Tom Grossman () and so much more. I mean, I could go on and on.

I really believe that this campaign, it's going to ensure that we continue to be the great university that is Cornell. I actually think we can be the model of a leading research university in the 21st century precisely, precisely because of our foundational commitment to human diversity, any person, and intellectual diversity, any study.

And with that, I will be open for questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If you are on Zoom and have a question, please raise your virtual hand. If you are in person and have a question, please move up to the microphone, and I'm looking on the list to see if there are any hands raised. Tara Holm, you're on. Two minutes, please.

TARA HOLM: Thank you. Oh, I won't need two minutes. Thank you. Thank you, Martha. This is -- I appreciate your vision, and I appreciate your leadership through this chaotic time.

I do have a question about some of the fundraising, and the strategic priorities of increasing the size of the student body. It's been fantastic to see the new dorms on North Campus, but it's been a challenge to have seats for those students in our classrooms. And I hope that going forward, the



university puts a priority, especially in sort of -- in soliciting donations specifically for classroom space, renovating and creating new classroom space on campus.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you. Yeah, we are interested in that. Now, I do want to be clear, I have said many times that this campaign is primarily going to be one of people, so our main priorities are for faculty, for endowed faculty, and for student support and for research support. But that doesn't mean that we're going to ignore important facility needs, and I appreciate your feedback on that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Tara, before we go to the next speaker, could you just identify your department?

TARA HOLM: Oh, sure. Sorry. I'm the chair of the Mathematics Department, and we struggle to have enough seats. We have more students -- we're not CS, but CS I know also struggles to find seats for their students.

MARTHA POLLACK: As someone who took -- wasn't a math major but took as many math courses as a math major as an undergraduate, I'm delighted that you're struggling for seats. That means our students are studying math, which is great. But I appreciate the input.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have an in-person speaker. Please identify yourself and your department.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: So, I'm Eric Cheyfitz from the American Indian and Indigenous Studies program. And I have a question about Cornell's history, actually. I had the opportunity to watch most of the promotional video that's out there, and it was stated in that video, actually by two of Ezra Cornell's descendants, that the funding for Cornell was based on his telegraph business.

In fact, we know that the funding, the bulk of the funding, not saying any didn't come from that business, but the bulk of the funding came from the Morrill Act of 1862, which appropriated massive

amounts of Indian lands. Cornell benefited by a million, close to a million, acres of those lands, and those lands were taken by force and fraud, that's been well documented, in the course of a national genocide.

So, what I'd like to know is why, in a video that is talking about Cornell's history, we can't have an honest accounting of that history, which does not deny that Cornell wants the greatest good for its constituency, but I think makes it more poignant that, having come out of that very, very desperate history, it is seeking to that.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you, Eric. You know, there was another video that had been made of - that I had seen earlier that was missing this history, and I asked to have it added to it. I will go back and look at those and see what we can do about mentioning the Morrill Act. We certainly are working, as you know, with the American Indian and Indigenous Studies Group program to address these issues. And I'll go back and take a look at that.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a Zoom speaker. Yuval Grossman. Please identify your department.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Okay. Yuval Grossman from Physics [indiscernible]. And [indiscernible] I was about to talk about is at the end of this meeting, but since you are here, I can share it right now. And I'm also the faculty advisor of the Men and the Women Water Polo team, and actually maybe not all of you know, but the Men team, we won the New York Championship. And we are going actually tomorrow to represent Cornell in Nationals.

And that bring me to the topic I wanted to talk about, and that's the pool situation at Cornell. And we all know the pool situation are not so good, how to say. And unfortunately, there's no plan to --

there's not even nothing in the plan to build a new pool. And what I'd like to argue, and I think everybody knows, that actually a pool for such university is extremely important. Not only important for athletic, it's important for all of us. It's important for faculty. I go to swim so much. That's my sport. It's important for everybody.

And my hope is that actually we will put it into the plan. And in particular, when we talk about all those kind of thing, it's extremely important. So, I just want to bring it to your attention.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you. I mean, we have a lot of needs at -- you know, that's all I can say. We have a lot of good needs for academic buildings, we have a lot of needs for renovation of student buildings, we have needs for better athletic facilities, and we just do try to manage all of these needs. But we can't handle them all at once. But I hear you, and we will add that to the list of needs.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I don't see any other hands raised. Oh, now I do. Risa Lieberwitz, please identify your department or school.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes, thank you. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thank you, Martha, for your information. I wanted to ask you about the resolution that the Senate passed quite overwhelmingly, 67 yes, 21 no, with regard to accommodations for faculty, instructors, staff, and students regarding health-related concerns. We passed that, you know, after the meeting of September 9th, and we got your response to it saying that Cornell does provide accommodations.

But what I wanted to ask you about today was the resolution including provisions calling on the university to create, basically, a consultative process with the Senate and other governance bodies to develop policies about reasonable accommodation for needs for a safe and healthy teaching and learning environments. And you know, unfortunately, this is not -- it's unlikely that this'll be the last

episode, you know, where we need to really have clarity on these kinds of accommodations. That's true generally.

We need clarity and good policies that people understand, both policies and processes, but unfortunately, we'll probably find other emergency situations come up as well. So, it seems like this is a good moment to say, how can we put together a working group to make sure that people are clear about what the policies are, and that we have processes for -- that are clear. Because there was enormous confusion and a lot of stress and real strain on people at the time that this was going on. But I'd love to hear your response to that.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah. I mean, I stand behind the response I gave to the resolution overall. If there are -- if there are specific issues, Risa, that you have concerns about, that you think aren't clear, I would welcome an email from you sort of laying out what those are. Because I know that -- I know that our accommodations folks have worked very hard to try and have clear and [indiscernible] processes, but if you're still seeing gaps, you know, write to me, and let me know what those gaps are.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are there any more questions for the president? Seeing no -- ah, just in at the last minute.

MARTHA POLLACK: It's like teaching.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Buz Barstow, please identify your department.

BUZ BARSTOW: Thank you very much. This is a last-minute question. I'm Buz Barstow, I'm an assistant professor at Biological and Environmental Engineering. Every time -- [indiscernible] President Pollack, every time, you know, you're here, I will always ask, what are we doing to reduce, or at least bend, the cost curve on the cost of higher education?

MARTHA POLLACK: Oh, well, we're doing all kinds of things. I mean, one of the things we did during -- actually, it started before the pandemic, was a campus-wide review of our staffing structures to see where it made more sense to streamline, if you will. We had an opportunity, because we had more turnover than usual, to streamline some things. The provost has been working closely with the deans, HR's been working closely with the deans.

Really every single thing we do, we try to reduce costs, but, but it is extraordinarily expensive to provide the quality of an education that we want to provide to our students, and it's extraordinary expensive to ensure that our faculty can thrive in the kinds of research activities that they need to be engaged in, in order to achieve their goals and do what we need for Cornell.

So, one of the things that we do, in addition to trying to bend the cost curve, is invest very heavily in financial aid so that students with need can still afford to come here. In fact, for almost 20 years now, students with need have not seen an increase in their actual costs, even net of the loans that they've taken out. So, it's a -- it's not just top line or bottom line. We have to work on both together.

If you have specific ideas, is there some area of ways that you think we could address -- I'm looking up there and only --

BUZ BARSTOW: Yeah. Actually --

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah.

BUZ BARSTOW: No, no. I will always ask the question. You know? It's a -- I view it as a perennial problem.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah.

BUZ BARSTOW: Every time I talk to my undergrads in my lab, this is their top concern always.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah.

BUZ BARSTOW: You know, it's -- so, I would say it's a national level concern. And I think it should be something that, you know, figuring out innovative ways to make higher education as accessible as we possibly can to promote --

MARTHA POLLACK: Yes.

BUZ BARSTOW: -- widest number of people, I think should always be on the top of [indiscernible].

MARTHA POLLACK: So, I actually hugely applaud that comment, and would invite you and all the faculty to think about ways that we can reach out, both to make things easier for our students, but also to reach out to broader sets of students who might otherwise not have access to Cornell kinds of education. The -- we're at a moment where we're going to have to be innovative and open minded.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No, we have -- I think time for one more. We have Ken Birman. Please get on and identify your department.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you. Yeah, thank you, Martha, for everything you've done over the last few years. It's really been a tough period, and we've been very, very lucky to have you guiding us.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you, Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: My question relates to last night, actually. I was concerned reading about this huge outpouring of police chasing a Black suspect with long hair in an area of the campus where we have a great number of Black students with long hair, that there could easily have been some form of accident. And especially after BLM, we know how sensitive that entire type of situation can be.

I'm wondering what actions the university took last night to guarantee the safety of our students, particularly the Black students who might easily have not even known that this was occurring and been out there walking around simply because they didn't, you know, check their email.

MARTHA POLLACK: So, Ken, where did you see that? Because I actually did -- I was actually pleased that I did not see references to physical description of the suspect. Was that -- and in fact, I think our police force --

KEN BIRMAN: I was overwhelmed by these things. I got two or three phone calls per, I don't know, I would say over periods of 15 minutes, I would get two or three phone calls which specifically said that they were searching for a tall Black man dressed in such-and-such a way.

MARTHA POLLACK: That's interesting, because our police force -- oh, it's Tompkins County. Okay. So, our police force has adopted a policy of not identifying the racial identity of a suspect, except in very, very extraordinary circumstances. But someone just posted a Tompkins County link. So, I can't control what Tompkins County -- what Tompkins County does, but the first thing I will tell you, Ken, is what I just said. We will not -- we will not identify those characteristics for the reasons you've said.

As far as protecting students, you know, we had CUPD out in droves. Just about every CUPD officer was out there. And the CUPD officers are actually quite sensitive to the needs of our students. So, hopefully they would sort of be there to protect students. I am sorry that Tompkins County did that, because we do not -- we do not publish that anymore.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you all so much for everything you're doing. Hang in there. It's almost Thanksgiving.

[applause].

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The next order of business is approval of minutes. We have minutes from the last three meetings, September 9th, September 22nd, October 13th. And for those of you who haven't looked at the minutes, they are not merely summaries or subjective summaries of what happened, but they are literal verbatim transcripts of the meetings themselves.

The tradition here is to ask for unanimous consent for these minutes. So, if there are no objections, and here I pause for a few seconds, raise your hand if there are objections. If there are no objections, and hearing none, the minutes are approved as posted.

Our next order of business is to hear from the Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa.

EVE DE ROSA: Hi, everyone. So, the first thing I wanted to do -- let me just get a -- fix this mike. So, the first thing I wanted to do is announce that Neema --

KEN BIRMAN: That seems to be a microphone that's turned off again.

JONATHAN OSCHORN: Keep going.

EVE DE ROSA: Is it --

KEN BIRMAN: No, that still seems to be turned off.

EVE DE ROSA: Do you hear me?

KEN BIRMAN: Very faintly.

EVE DE ROSA: Hello, hello, hello. Should I go -- I'll go to the other mike because -- I'll go to this mike, since that seemed to work before. Is it working, Ken? Okay. Then I guess I'll continue.

So, I have only four points, and the first one is I thought it was appropriate for us, as a faculty, to have our own listening session to talk about how the recent threats to the campus have affected faculty.



There have been community opportunities and student opportunities, but I think that faculty, with their families impacted by these threats, and just we deserve an opportunity to speak to each other about the impacts.

And so, Neema and I are going to hold one next Wednesday, probably around noon, 12:00 or 12:30, and I'll announce it in the Monday message. So, I just wanted to check in with the faculty and learn, you know, what things that need to be communicated to the administration.

My second point that I wanted to share with you is that I -- Risa Lieberwitz, as president of the AAUP, and I -- so, the president of the Cornell Chapter of the AAUP, had a conversation, and one of the things, and I think today really does suggest that this is a very real thing, we talked about faculty engagement. And the fact that there are only 80ish people in attendance today out of 130, and only 80ish of the Senators are actually voting on our resolutions, we have a real core third of the Senate that's not engaged.

And so, we were strategizing, how can we build that? How can we -- and part of it could be the fact that our resolutions are not being passed with enough significance for it to actually have impact with the administration. And so, one of the ideas that came out of this conversation was having, once a semester, a faculty forum on an issue that's important to us outside of the Senate, and we'd invite all faculty to be a part of it. And just to get faculty voices engaged, maybe it will spill over into the Senate.

And so, on December 15th, we're going to have a faculty forum, and that forum will have a panel. And so, I invite everybody to give me ideas for who you'd like to see on this panel. The topic will be on academic materials and supplies. Especially in light of the fact that many textbooks and things are going electronic. What's the impact on our students and our faculty?

So, I just wanted to share the topic. I will start to share it widely and to build a panel. And so, I just invite anybody that has ideas about who you'd like to speak on this topic, share them with me. I would love to have a textbook writer. I do know that. So, if you have ideas, please share them.

Resolution 170 was passed last spring, and that is related to two of the pending resolutions from today. And so, Resolution 170 was making the tenure procedure public. And I just wanted to give an update to the Senate that we've reached out to all the deans -- so, we have 10 colleges, 10 deans -- and majority have made the procedures for tenure public inside of the Cornell community. Some are completely public to the general public, but most are within Cornell. So, you have to have a NetID to access their publicly posted procedures.

One college has not moved their procedures online at all. And then three colleges have an intranet. And so, I just wanted to share that you, that we -- I will work with those four deans, really just the one college that hasn't made it public at all. And I just wanted to let you know that that resolution has some impact, and that people are following the Senate's wishes.

And the continued work that the AFPSF -- so, you'll hear two resolutions from the AFPSF today -- on continuing transparency for tenure. So, one is going to be about the external -- choice of external reviewers, and the other one about the no-contact list for external reviewers. And I'll let Tracy, Senator Tracy Stokol, present that.

But I wanted to share with you that the AFPSF is also going to work on the -- another form of transparency, and this is something that I brought to them as a concern, because we have new faculty, and newer faculty, who have been at the university only a few years, that are going into new cultures with completely different standards for tenure. And so, they're in these very difficult situations with the super departments, the school -- the College of Business, the School of Public Policy. They're in many

places where all of a sudden, new faculty, new culture, will be having an impact on your ability to get tenure. And so, that's another conversation that we're having in that space.

And then, the last update that I wanted to share with you is that the Task Force will be meeting in the coming weeks. We have one of our chairs -- so, this is the Task Force on RTE faculty. We're going to be looking at a system wide solution for RTE in terms of trying to standardize, as best we can, the titles, how to be promoted within the system, and there's a real serious inclusion climate issue that we'd like to also address.

And so, it's a large committee. We have representation across the university. And we'll have two co-chairs, and we have one already accepted, Kim Kopko, who's our RTE in the College of Human Ecology. And we have an ask out, but we haven't gotten an acceptance yet for that.

And so, that is all I wanted to share, and I think I've pretty much run out of time. So, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. As Eve mentioned, there's several pending resolutions. Each one will have a 3-minute presentation, and then 10 minutes for questions and answers. The first one, proposed resolution, one resolution on No-Contact Lists in Tenure Cases will be presented by Tracy Stokol, Population Medicine and Diagnostic Science.

TRACY STOKOL: Thank you. So, the no-contact list, is there a slide on that, Eve?

EVE DE ROSA: Yes.

TRACY STOKOL: Okay. So, this is what colleges do a canvas before this came, and these resolutions I will just state up front came out of the tenure project that Charlie Van Loan started last year. And the goal of both of these resolutions is to increase the transparency of what is happening within the tenure dossiers.

So, there are several reasons why a candidate may wish to say that someone should be on a no-contact list as far as an external reviewer, and these are listed here. And as you can see, there really isn't consistency across the colleges. And this resolution is for the best practice.

Okay. So, next slide. So, we propose that the candidate can place in the dossier no-contact lists with a brief explanation as to why that person should not be contacted for an external review letter. The department can still request a letter from that, but then must produce a justification that becomes part of the dossier. And as indicated there, there is more details on the Resolution web page.

And I think that's it. So, great, yes. Discussion.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So again, if you're in Zoom and have questions or comments, raise your hand. If you're in person, come down to the microphone. So, it's usually when I say there's no questions, that a question pops up. So, I'll try that. Looks like there are no questions. In that case, I think we'll move on to proposed Resolution two.

TRACY STOKOL: Great. Thanks, Jon.

So, this resolution is about the process by which external reviewers are selected. There is some information on this in the current Faculty Handbook, but it's a little vague. And basically, the dossier just states which external reviewers were chosen by the candidate, and which are chosen by the department.

Again, to increase transparency and to just make it fair and open, we are suggesting that the candidate and a department list are independently created with thought going into who do you think would be the best person to reflect your scholarship and your future potential. Both lists will go into the dossier, but the department will then use the lists to produce the final list, deciding on the numbers of the external reviewers nominated by the candidate, nominated by the department, and then, of course,

their final list should also include which come from the department, and which come from the candidate.

The Faculty Handbook I will note does state that at least five reviewers that are on the list need to be external to Cornell, on the final list. And that we haven't altered. So, there have to be five external reviewers for any tenure dossier. But this is just -- gives transparency as to which candidates were selected and which weren't.

The other thing that we wanted in the dossier, which is not listed here, is if any of the candidates -- if any of the reviewers that were proposed by the candidate or the department, and were asked to provide an external letter of review, if they declined and if they gave a reason for declining that process, that should be also listed in the dossier.

Oh, I think that's it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And if there are questions or comments, please raise your digital hand in Zoom, or step up to the front of the auditorium.

TRACY STOKOL: And I will just point out that these -- both of these resolutions were reworded from that originally stated after discussion amongst the committee and with Eve.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And we do have a Zoom question/comment. Risa Lieberwitz, again, state your department or school.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes. Thanks. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thanks, Tracy, for this presentation. I think this -- these are such important issues. And I have a couple questions. One is the -- how much of this would be mandated by the -- you know, if this were adopted, and how much is suggested? You know, I just don't recall now that relationship.

TRACY STOKOL: Yes. Yes. So, again resolutions, if this -- if both these resolutions are passed, it's never a mandate. It's always a recommended best practice. But if these resolutions pass by a good margin, as Eve was pointing out, later then that's a strong message to the departments that they should follow these practices. And Eve has promised to follow up on these resolutions, as she just did, with making the tenure process public.

And also, continue to engage with departments that have not yet followed through with the resolutions. So, kind of that quiet, shall I say, pressure being put onto the departments we hope will make this widely adopted university wide.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Great. Thanks. And I had another question, which is, I guess for clarity for me, too, if you had the independent lists created, and then both lists include the same people, it would seem to make sense that all of those people would go on the outside reviewer list. But I didn't see anything in the recommendation for that.

TRACY STOKOL: Yeah. That's a great question, and honestly, we don't want to be too prescriptive and enforce things. We would rather each college makes its own decisions. And I would agree with you, it seems logical that if the same person is nominated by the faculty member and the department, that that person should be asked.

However, there has been discussion about how we have asked lots of external reviewers, and they say no because they don't have the time, they're just getting overwhelmed by lots of requests. And so, that's why the committee suggested having, if someone was asked and declined, the reason why.

And of course, it's up to factor () if there were two names put on there and they weren't even asked, that, you know, could potentially be a red flag for faculty members to follow up with the department as to why they weren't asked. Which I think would be surprising if the department

nominated them. But this just makes it much more transparent, because you know who is nominated by both, and what -- where the final reviewer list was selected from.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Last call for questions or comments.

TRACY STOKOL: Okay. Great. So, I think there'll be a vote on the resolution, but if any of you have any other feedback from the people in your departments, please you can either email me directly, or you can simply post it, and better to post it, on the Senate web page under the resolution as comments, which we already responded to with the revised resolutions. Thank you.

MARK LEWIS: Sorry. I don't know if you can hear me. I was trying to raise my hand and couldn't get my hand raised for a question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Oh, I didn't see you. So, Mark Lewis, please identify your department.

MARK LEWIS: Yeah. Yeah. Sorry about that. Mark Lewis, Operations Research and Information Engineering in the College of Engineering. My question is about something in the resolution that I'm not sure it appeared on the slide, which says that as a minimum number of people that are chosen from each of those lists. Is that something that one would then have at the college level? Or is that one that would then -- would be reported at the department level?

TRACY STOKOL: Okay. So, college department, I think that's for each college to decide what minimum number will be selected from each list. I'm not -- again, we're not trying to be prescriptive, but just to state that this information ideally should be made publicly available, or in some way made available to all faculty so that they can see what the guidelines of the department are, versus changing it for one faculty versus another.

So, I -- we, again, don't want to be prescriptive as to that minimum number because it may change, particularly if people say no to the external review. You may have to go back to the candidate to get more external reviewer names. But the -- you know, it's implicit in the resolution, but it's not stated.

If you think this should be stated in the resolution which is going to get incorporated into the Faculty Handbook, then you should propose, I think, not on good on Senate rules here, but maybe propose an amendment to the resolution stating that these minimum numbers should be made available to all faculty in the section, department, or college.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I'm looking hard for other raised hands. Sometimes I miss them. So, I'm not seeing any.

So, I think we can move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the third pending resolution. Resolution on consultation with the Faculty Senate with respect to Global Hubs. We have a three-minute presentation, and then a 10-minute discussion. Presentation by Professor Eric Cheyfitz, American Indian and Indigenous Studies Program, who is here in person.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: I am indeed. Thank you. The slide is up there, and I'm going, in the interest of time, assume that everybody has seen this. This is a proposal. I want to make clear I'm not against Global Hubs, but for faculty participation in what is clearly an academic program vis-à-vis Cornell University bylaws, Article 13 Section 2, which says the faculty needs to review policy, educational policy, that cuts across programs, departments, disciplines, colleges, et cetera. And it is resolved, after looking at the reasons why the faculty should have input into these matters, that they are obviously curricular matters.

So, it should be clear to everybody why the resolution says that the Central Administration should not continue to expand the network of Global Hubs until the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies has reported to the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate has had an opportunity to



discuss the report, including any and all resolutions that might be offered at that time. So, the Senate, vis-à-vis the bylaws, has not had a chance to discuss this program.

I want to read then some background on it, which should take a couple of minutes. Cornell already has a significant footprint in the International Educational Programs involving collaboration between Cornell faculty and students and its partners abroad. Programs such as the Medical School in Cutter, and Cornell Tech's partnership with Technion in Israel are examples of such programs which were never vetted before the Faculty Senate as is mandated in Article 13, Section 2 of the bylaws.

In both these cases, there were serious, and remain serious, ethical issues which remain, that were bypassed in the agreements negotiated. Issues that, had these relationships come before the Faculty Senate, would have at least, at least, received a public airing.

With Global Hubs now significantly underway without any reviews so far by the Faculty Senate, the university plans to enlarge its footprint globally with, to begin, specifically targeted sites. Quote, "partnerships with institutions in Australia, China," where there already are relationships, "Ecuador, Ghana, India, Mexico, Singapore, South Korea, Thailand, United Kingdom, and Zambia are in process, and additional partnerships in Denmark, Morocco, and Turkey are being investigated." End of quote.

Further under quote, "what are the criteria for selecting a partner?" That's the criteria, the question mark, what are the criteria? In Cornell Global Hubs frequently questions, there is no mention of any AAUP standards regarding academic freedom and tenure, nor any matter of human rights.

Okay. So, that is not listed in the criteria. As it stands, Cornell has developed two sets of institutional standards. One for its U.S. campuses, where AAUP standards are enforced, and one for its foreign partners where apparently, these standards are contingent and subordinate to economic issues.

At best, under Article 13, Section 2, the faculty has advisory responsibility in these matters, and the administration is free to take or disregard this advice. But if the faculty abdicates this responsibility, then it abdicates its responsibility to influence educational policy, and more importantly, it leaves no public record of its views on what should be at the heart of a Cornell education.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I'm looking for comments or questions, either in person or on Zoom. If you're on Zoom, raise your hand. If you're in person, step up to the front. I see Laurent Dubreuil perhaps. Pronounce your name correctly and indicate your department.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Hi, it's quite good. It's quite good. Laurent Dubreuil, Faculty Senator for Romance Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. It's a brief comment. Just quoting what Eric Cheyfitz said one minute ago. That the Central Administration, that resolution, would still be free to take or disregard the opinion of the faculty. And I find it quite interesting that we should have such a debate about the possibility for the faculty to have a vote, a formal discussion, and then an opinion through the only official channel that we have with all its limitations, that is the Faculty Senate. I mean, it should not even be a controversial issue for us to have an opinion, and to send it to the Central Administration.

So, I'm a bit flabbergasted by the insistence coming from [indiscernible] to try to avoid any public discussion, and any public opinion being formulated by the faculty through the Senate. Although, the Central Administration would have the final say in the end. Just [indiscernible].

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Eric, you're free to respond. And then I have Katherine Caggiano.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: Well, I share Laurent's flabbergastedness, if that's a word, about the fact that this is just a matter of giving the faculty a voice in a decision that the administration only ultimately can make. If I were to rewrite the bylaws, and of course, that won't -- I won't be given that privilege, or if the faculty were to rewrite them, I would say that in matters of curriculum, the faculty actually should have

not only advice, but consent. We do not have consent now, and so it is possible for us to widely object to standards that are being opposed by the administration without any reverberations whatsoever.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Katherine, could you state your name and department?

KATHERINE CAGGIANO: Thank you, yes. This is Katherine Caggiano. I am in Operations Research and Information Engineering, College of Engineering. Really, I just have a question about the resolution here and the timing. Is there an anticipated timeline with which the Faculty Senate is expecting the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies to produce this report?

ERIC CHEYFITZ: I don't know of any timeline at this point, but it's a good point. We should probably find out within what time parameters is it going to take place, so that we can actually have a discussion here, after CAPPs has issued reports, that we can actually have a discussion in the Senate about the resolution.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a raised hand from Richard BenseL. Please indicate your department.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard BenseL, the Government Department. I think the resolution speaks to Katherine's point. The expansion, further expansion, of the Global Hubs system should not proceed until CAPP reports. So, it's up to CAPP to report. It's a faculty committee, and it's -- one would think that if this resolution were to pass, that that would -- that would hasten things a bit.

I'm going to say some things that -- to expand on Eric's points. One is that in -- this is a process that, of course, the Faculty Senate has implemented so that CAPP reports is the last stage to the Faculty Senate before these programs would be implemented. We're a little bit in a strange spot, because these programs are already being created, and they've been created for some months now. And so, we would -- yes, involvement in these programs is a difficult thing.

There are three reasons, I think, or a number of reasons, why faculty consultation in Global Hubs is important. The first is, that this is -- Cornell University is becoming a multi-national educational institution. These are vast expansions of the university's footprint, academically, intellectually, professionally, in terms of research. They really should have some kinds of descriptions and consultation with the Faculty Senate about the academic quality of these programs, the advice and design on implementation, and so forth. That is one reason.

The second Eric brought up. But let me read a line from the Cornell Policy Statement on academic freedom, and freedom of speech and expression. That statement says, "freedoms to engage in research and scholarship, to teach and to learn, to express oneself, and to be heard, and to assemble and to protest peacefully and lawfully are essential to the function of the university as an educational institution."

That statement applies, should apply, to the vast multi-national archipelago now that Cornell has established abroad, as well as to the Ithaca Campus. And one of the things we should do is to look and see how well we are doing in terms of academic freedom and freedom of speech in these other institutions.

The third concern I think that the resolution addresses is that for a decade now, there has been a very strong positive correlation between the expansion of Cornell's collaborative programs, and the increasing repressive environment of the host institutions with which we are involved. It seems almost lockstep that as repression goes up, so does Cornell's involvement abroad. There should be some statement about, and some consideration, about how conditions can be, if perhaps they might be, so bad that we might withdraw such collaborations, that we might terminate them, that have some conditions.

I have no expectation that Cornell's Policy Statement on academic freedom is going to apply in most of the Global Hubs that Cornell is now creating. But at least we should have some kind of discussion about what the minimal standards, the minimal existence of academic freedom and freedom of speech should be in order to teach, in order for Cornell to be an educational system with some integrity. That's it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And we should try to keep the comments to two minutes, even though we do have some extra time. Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa, is in person and wishes to speak.

EVE DE ROSA: It's just a procedural one. I just wanted to let everyone know that Mark Milstein, who's the Senator from the College of Business, is going to update the Senate on what CAPP -- so, has been sort of working on in terms of Global Hubs. And also, he is -- so, as it is right now, CAPP and the Committee are over -- are discussing Global Hubs before it goes to the vice provost of International Affairs. And Mark Milstein is the representative from CAPP on the International Council. So, I just wanted to make that clear.

And then also, that he'll be giving us an update in the December Senate.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have some extra time, so Risa Lieberwitz is -- has her hand raised.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. Thank you. And thanks, Eve, for that information about CAPP, the CAPPs Committee reporting in December.

I think that's really good that CAPPs is involved, and I -- and it actually relates to one of the points I was thinking about. You know, in the resolution it says that the vice provost for International Affairs, Wendy Wolford, you know, did say that -- as she said, we are open to your suggestions for how it

is that the Faculty Senate be engaged. And so, you know, this really is our responsibility to work on these issues.

And I was wanting to mention about the discussion we had had earlier in the Senate with regard to dual degree and joint degree programs, which is that CAPPs would be involved, and reporting to this Senate. So, I hope that CAPPs report to the Senate will be something more than this is what we think, but also with something for us to vote on. Not only to discuss, but to vote on.

And for example, you know, the issue that's -- that Eric raised and is -- has been discussed today about AAUP standards, how will we ensure that those are followed? And at what stages will we assess that, prior to the Global Hub being created? You know? And then during some process over time to do evaluation.

And then, there's also just the other question of, what is the process for developing Global Hubs? What will that process be? And I hope that CAPPs, the CAPPs Committee, will do the work on that and that there will be some way for us, before they report to us, to provide input to them. Will there be a draft put up from the Committee so that we can respond to it? Because I think this is a really important moment for us to be engaged.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I'm looking for other questions, comments. Seeing none. No raised hands.

I think we'll move on to the final section, which is the Good and Welfare, or Good of the Order. We had two speakers scheduled to speak. The first has already spoken, but maybe wants to reiterate comments. Yuval Grossman, are you still here?

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Yes, I am. And I'd be happy to kind of say it again and ask for a little more help for the topic. So, [indiscernible] I was planning to talk about the situation with the swimming pool,

and it's clear that is not, right now, the top priority of the administration. And I feel that actually it's extremely important. In particular, when we keep hearing how important it is that we make sure that the health and the mental health of our students are important, and -- but [indiscernible] from you know, Club Water Polo, and I assume it's also for swimmers, it's extremely important for our student to be involved in club sports.

And particularly, it's really -- I can really see how that's so useful. And right now, the pools are dying. I mean, totally dying. We, the water polo team, we are basically out of the pool. There's the club swimmer out of the pool. And even if we start right now to plan for a pool, this is not going to happen in the at least 10 years or more.

So, what I hope to do is to actually have other faculty members who care about it, so we can actually -- need more than just me going out. And if there's anybody else who feel that this is an important issue, please let me know, and hopefully we can actually do something together. Thanks.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Eve, do you have something to say?

EVE DE ROSA: Yes. So, Yuval, I just want -- and the rest of the Senate -- I wanted to also let you know that the University Faculty Committee is going to be meeting with Ryan Lombardi, the VP of Student Campus Life, and also the chair of -- I'm going to call it FACAPE, F-A-C-A-P-E, the physical education committee that we have in the Senate, the chair of that Senate committee is in discussion with the UFC as well, because the university is considering dropping the swim test.

And so, we would love faculty feedback on that topic. We'll be discussing that in our November meeting. So, I wanted to share that, and maybe, Yuval, you can -- you can advocate for the importance of the swim test there as well.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: So, actually, I'd be very happy to talk to you offline about this, and maybe you can fill me in, and see what I can help with all this. Okay?

EVE DE ROSA: Yes. Thank you. And I should let you guys know that the -- this discussion will come in the spring semester.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have the second and last of the Good of the Order, Ken Birman, Computer Science.

KEN BIRMAN: Yes. Ken Birman. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to the Senate here. I'd like to raise a question of personal interest in the hope of finding some others who'd be interested in this topic and joining me in researching it.

I'm approaching the age of retirement, I'm going to be 66 this year, and I've started to think ahead. But because I'm still active as a researcher, and I have substantial amount of grant funding, I've realized that the transition to emeritus faculty, at least in my research area, would be problematic. It would -- it would impair my grant success substantially, as far as I can tell. I know that there are other areas where this is not the case. I also have quite a bit of existing soft money to work with.

However -- so, the question becomes, do we have a soft path from full professor with full activity teaching, to emeritus that might span a couple of years, and allow a person to pivot? It occurred to me that the research professor positions that we've created, we created them with [indiscernible] actually about five years ago, could be an answer to this, but in fact, in the way that the Senate ultimately drafted the enabling legislation, we precluded the use of those titles for this type of internal transitioning purpose. They were designed and legislated to be for, let's call it Nobel Prize winning level work for people who are going to be on soft money, maybe attracted to Cornell as directors of institutes, but not for internal transitional use.



So, what I want to suggest to the Senate is that a few of us who share this interest, if any, might get together -- [technical issue]. Sorry about that, my thing muted temporarily.

Get together and discuss whether we might be able to adapt legislation without causing harm to the intent of the Senate when it was originally set up so that we would create an additional transitional path where a person could become -- who is currently a full faculty professor, like myself, I'm a chair professor actually, could become essentially director of their own research institute, drawing again soft money, and continuing to be funded from grant funding, but doing pure research. And then, over time, transitioning to emeritus.

So, I simply wanted to put that out, see whether there are other units that are receiving this type of a need, and might find that type of a pathway useful. Also understand if there's opposition to this idea from some of the people who insisted on these strong constraints when we first created the research professor title.

So, that was all I wanted to do. I've shared my email address in the chat, and people who would share an interest in this, or are very opposed to it, please get in touch. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And we've come to the end of the agenda. We still have some remaining time, but not having any other agenda items, I would propose to seek unanimous consent to adjourn this meeting. And if you object, raise your hand. Seeing no objections, [gavel thumps on wood], the meeting is adjourned.